

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 33 and 39 to 41 and claims 33 and 39 to 41 have been canceled.

Claims 34 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Claim 34 has been canceled. Claim 47 has been amended to recite a dependency on claim 1 and to delete H as a possible substituent of X_1 .

Removal of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim 76 is objected to. The spelling error in claim 76 has been corrected.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,030,904 ("Grill"). Claims 1, 33 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharangpani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,303,524; hereinafter "Sharangpani"). Claims 1, 31, 33, 34, 49 and 73 to 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,372,666; hereinafter "Ramos").

Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claim 1 to include the limitations of claims that are not included in all of the rejections.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramos in view of Yahagi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0092854; hereinafter "Yahagi"). Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramos in view of Usami (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0017402).

The present amendments to the claims limit the process of the present application to those materials recited in claims 39 to 41. The process of amended claim 1 provides the benefit of processing these materials of obtaining essentially nonporous products. Such products have excellent dielectric properties. Neither the combination of Ramos and Yahagi nor the combination of Ramos and Usami suggests that an essentially nonporous product having excellent dielectric properties can be obtained by a process as now recited in amended claim 1.

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramos in view of Grill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,030,904 ("Grill"). Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramos in view of Yamakawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,518,204 ("Yamakawa").

The propriety of these rejections depends on the rejection of claim 1, upon which claims 56 and 76 ultimately depend. Since

claim 1 has been shown to be patentable, claims 56 and 76 are *prima facie* patentable.

Removal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of the claims is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Office Action dated May 21, 2007.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 111833.

In the event any additional fees are required, please also charge our Deposit Account No. 111833.

Respectfully submitted,
KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK



Ronald J. Kubovcik
Reg. No. 25,401

Crystal Gateway 3
Suite 1105
1215 South Clark Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel: (703) 412-9494
Fax: (703) 412-9345
RJK/JBF